

*Law Offices of*  
**SUSAN CHANA LASK**

**244 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2369  
New York, N.Y. 10001**

**(212) 358-5762**

[www.appellate-brief.com](http://www.appellate-brief.com)

August 30, 2007  
Honorable Joseph Rodriguez  
Honorable Joel Schneider  
Mitchell H. Cohen Federal Building & U.S. Courthouse  
1 John F. Gerry Plaza  
Camden, NJ 08101

Re: Florence v. Burlington, et. al. Index No. 05-cv3619

Dear Your Honors:

In response to Honorable Schneider's August 29, 2007 letter electronically filed and received today, please note Judge Schneider's July 18, 2007 order mandated Plaintiff shall file its motion by August 1, 2007 (**Exhibit A**). Plaintiff followed that order (see docket). Plaintiff's June 22, 2007 letter was forwarded to Judge Rodriguez pursuant to Judge Schnieder's chambers' direction of about June 20, 2007, and copied to all counsel (**Exhibit "B"**). That letter was clear that Plaintiff did not agree with Mr. Ruddy's again request for extending what is now a 2 year old case. That letter made clear that a review of the docket shows Defendants obstructed this case, ignored simple procedure and law, and ignored every court ordered mandated date. Defendants, being two different law offices, never responded to that letter. Thus, the final motion schedule was left in the hands of Judge Rodriguez based upon the docket and history of this case.

On August 2, 2007 Judge Rodriguez ordered "Setting Deadlines as to [73] MOTION to Certify Class. Motion returnable date set for 9/7/2007 before Judge Joseph H. Rodriguez." (**Exhibit "C"**) docket). Defendants made no objection to that Order. Since then I have contacted Defendants in writing and by phone informing they must adhere to that Order (**Exhibit "D"**). Defendants ignored my demands and ignored this Court's Order. According to Judge Schneider's recent filed letter, Mr. Ruddy has again taken valuable time to instead complain that he wants to ignore this Court's Order and the law by having the time to contact the magistrate rather than sitting down and drafting his opposition and filing it when it was due on August 20, 2007. Mr. Ruddy's complaint to obstruct a court order has no business in this Federal Court. Plaintiff is spellbound as to how he can ignore every court order in this case, as well as clear law and local procedure.

Plaintiff objects to Defendants obstructionist tactics and respectfully requests their late filings be denied. Please review the docket and note Defendants' obstructions to this 2 year old case, and confirm Plaintiff has brought this obstruction problem to the court's attention for over a year, yet Defendants continue to abuse this process and ignore law and court orders. Plaintiff and all those persons being strip searched this very moment deserve this Court's attention to the fact that Defendants are purposely obstructing this matter wherein the law clearly abhors their ongoing blanket strip searches.

Very truly yours,  
LAW OFFICES OF SUSAN CHANA LASK

*Susan Chana Lask*

SUSAN CHANA LASK

cc: Karen Savage, Esq., Alan Ruddy

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY  
CAMDEN VICINAGE

---

ALBERT W. FLORENCE,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS OF  
THE COUNTY OF BURLINGTON, et  
al.,

Defendants.

---

Civil No. 05-3619 (JHR)

**AMENDED SCHEDULING ORDER**

**IT IS** this **18th** day of **July, 2007**, hereby **ORDERED**:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification shall be filed no later than **August 1, 2007**.

2. The Court will conduct an **in-person** status conference on **October 4, 2007 at 11:30 a.m. FAILURE TO APPEAR WILL LEAD TO THE IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS, INCLUDING COSTS.**

**THE FAILURE OF A PARTY OR ATTORNEY TO OBEY THIS ORDER MAY RESULT IN IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 16(f).**

s/ Joel Schneider

JOEL SCHNEIDER

United States Magistrate Judge

*Law Offices of*  
**SUSAN CHANA LASK**

*244 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2369*  
*New York, N.Y. 10001*

**(212) 358-5762**

[www.appellate-brief.com](http://www.appellate-brief.com)

June 22, 2007

VIA FAX 856-757-5077

Honorable Joseph H. Rodriguez  
Mitchell H. Cohen Federal Building & U.S. Courthouse  
1 John F. Gerry Plaza  
Camden, NJ 08101

Re: Florence v. Burlington, et. al. Index No. 05-cv3619

Dear Your Honor:

I am counsel for Plaintiff. This is a section 1983 civil rights class action complaint against Burlington and Essex Jails for unlawfully strip searching all arrestees charged with non-indictable offenses from 2003 to the present.

Pursuant to Magistrate Schneider's direction, I am informing Your Honor of the following motion schedule informally agreed to by the parties for Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification:

Motion filed on August 1, 2007,  
Opposition filed no later than September 14, 2007  
reply filed by September 28, 2007.  
The Motion date according to the above would be October 5, 2007.

It is now two years since this case was filed. There were extensive delays caused by Defendant Essex' objections all denied by the court and their failure to provide discovery (as the docket shows). Plaintiff would prefer Your Honor ordering a shorter schedule for Defendants' to file opposition and Plaintiff's reply papers so we may meet an earlier motion date. If Your Honor agrees to the above schedule, then Plaintiff notes it should be made clear that because it was Defendant Essex' counsel Alan Ruddy who requested the extended motion schedule for Defendant Essex to file opposition 45 days after the motion is filed then Plaintiff notes Defendants shall not delay nor have any further adjournment to the above schedule to file opposition.

Very truly yours,  
LAW OFFICES OF SUSAN CHANA LASK  
*Susan Chana Lask*  
SUSAN CHANA LASK

cc: Karen Savage, Esq., Alan Ruddy

**EXHIBIT C**

**From:** njdefiling@njd.uscourts.gov [mailto:njdefiling@njd.uscourts.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 02, 2007 9:26 AM  
**To:** ecfhelp@njd.uscourts.gov  
**Subject:** Activity in Case 1:05-cv-03619-JHR-JS FLORENCE v. BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS OF THE COUNTY OF BURLINGTON et al Set/Reset Motion and R&R Deadlines/Hearings

**This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.**

**\*\*\*NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS\*\*\* You may view the filed documents once without charge. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.**

**U.S. District Court**

**District of New Jersey [LIVE]**

**Notice of Electronic Filing**

**The following transaction was entered on 8/2/2007 at 9:25 AM EDT and filed on 8/2/2007**

**Case Name:** FLORENCE v. BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS OF THE  
COUNTY OF BURLINGTON et al

**Case Number:** [1:05-cv-3619](#)

**Filer:**

**Document**  
**Number:** No document attached

**Docket Text:**

**Setting Deadlines as to [73] MOTION to Certify Class. Motion returnable date set for 9/7/2007 before Judge Joseph H. Rodriguez. PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT THIS MOTION WILL BE DECIDED ON THE PAPERS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTIFIED BY THE COURT. (sb)**

**1:05-cv-3619 Notice has been electronically mailed to:**

**MICHAEL V. CALABRO michaelv.calabro@verizon.net**

**J. BROOKS DIDONATO bdidonato@parkermccay.com, deirich@parkermccay.com**

**SUSAN CHANA LASK scl@appellate-brief.com**

**ALAN R. RUDDY aruddy@counsel.essexcountynj.org, csweat@counsel.essexcountynj.org**

**1:05-cv-3619 Notice has been delivered by other means to:**

**EXHIBIT C**

EXHIBIT D

*Law Offices of*  
**SUSAN CHANA LASK**

*244 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2369*  
*New York, N.Y. 10001*

(212) 358-5762

www.appellate-brief.com

VIA FAX 856-757-5077  
August 22, 2007

Honorable Joseph H. Rodriguez  
Mitchell H. Cohen Federal Building & U.S. Courthouse  
1 John F. Gerry Plaza  
Camden, NJ 08101

Re: Florence v. Burlington, et. al. Index No. 05-cv3619

Dear Your Honor:

I am counsel for Plaintiff. This is a section 1983 civil rights class action complaint against Burlington and Essex Jails for unlawfully strip searching all arrestees charged with non-indictable offenses from 2003 to the present. The docket of this case shows that this matter has been prolonged extensively due to Defendants delays by oppositions filed and denied and adjournments to every court order in this matter for two years.

On June 22, 2007 I wrote to you with a proposed schedule for Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification, noting that Defendants again requested a protracted time past local rules to file their opposition. Pursuant to this Court's Order, the motion was filed August 1, 2007. On August 2, 2007 this Court set the Motion deadline for 9/7/2007 before Your Honor. Defendants' opposition was due August 21, 2007, yet not filed. Pursuant to Local R. 7.1(1) "**Unless a Judge or Magistrate Judge advises the attorneys otherwise, all motions, regardless of their complexity and the relief sought, shall be presented and defended in the manner set forth in L. Civ. R. 7.1.**" Defendants have not timely filed opposition papers nor contacted the clerk to request an extension in any way pursuant to R. 7.1.

Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court to order Defendants to file their opposition, if any, within 5 days as there is no reason for this matter to be extended beyond Your Honor's court ordered September 7, 2007 date, nor should defendants' ignore your order.

Very truly yours,  
LAW OFFICES OF SUSAN CHANA LASK

*Susan Chana Lask*

SUSAN CHANA LASK

cc: Karen Savage, Esq., Alan Ruddy

EXHIBIT D

**EXHIBIT D**

**From:** Susan Chana Lask [mailto:suethemall.com@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 24, 2007 4:30 PM  
**To:** 'Karen J. Savage'  
**Cc:** 'Alan Ruddy'; 'michaelv.calabro'  
**Subject:** RE: JR-DsLate

my letter to judge rodriguez informed that Plaintiff did not agree with the extension. you received that letter. J rodriguez' order set the date as 9/7--that is a court order. your recollection is wrong, we did not have a phone conference with J Schneider-that was waived.

issue-defendants have obstructed this from moving forward, and every obstruction was found wrong by the courts. Most important, the issue is the fact that people are being strip searched unlawfully every day defendants obstruct this case. Possibly an an injunction motion is needed to be filed monday if defendants do not see what the courts clearly do.

---

**From:** Karen J. Savage [mailto:ksavage@parkermccay.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 24, 2007 2:47 PM  
**To:** Susan Chana Lask; Alan Ruddy; michaelv.calabro  
**Subject:** RE: JR-DsLate

Susan I am a bit perplexed by your recent correspondence to the Court. We all understood (as evidenced by your 7/25/07 email) that opposition date for class certification motion was due on 9/14/07. My memory is that we discussed that with Judge Schneider in a telephone conference. I will concede, however, that a review of my file indicates that the electronic case management order reflects opposition being due on 8/27/07- although I think the date is in error, based on our collective impressions. Regardless, that is the Order that I have. It begs the question--what is your issue?

---

**From:** Susan Chana Lask [mailto:suethemall.com@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 22, 2007 7:15 AM  
**To:** 'Alan Ruddy'; Karen J. Savage  
**Cc:** 'michaelv.calabro'; althepals@aol.com  
**Subject:** JR-DsLate

**EXHIBIT D**